

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement for restriction are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith.

The April 27, 2006, Office Action required an election under 35 U.S.C. § 121 from two Groups. In response, Applicants provisionally elect the invention of Group I, claims 1-14 and 20, drawn to DPP-IV crystal and method of crystallization, classified in class 435, subclass 212, for further prosecution in this application. This election is made *with traverse* and without prejudice to Applicants' right to file divisional applications directed to the non-elected subject matter.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's reasoning that restriction is required. Applicants respectfully urge that the Restriction Requirement does not establish that searching the subject matter of the two Groups would constitute an undue burden to the Patent Office. Moreover, Applicants urge that the Restriction Requirement is contrary to public policy. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn or at least modified.

The MPEP lists two criteria for a proper restriction requirement. First, the invention must be independent or distinct. MPEP § 803. Second, searching the additional Group must constitute an undue burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. *Id.* The MPEP directs the examiner to search and examine an entire application “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden...even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.” *Id.*

Applicants urge that the Restriction Requirement, *inter alia*, does not meet the second of these criteria as the search for the groups overlap. For example, the two Groups belong to overlapping classes (class 435, subclass 212). Therefore, searching the claims of the two Groups would not pose an undue burden on the Examiner.

Further, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's bases for restriction. The present claims clearly represent a web of knowledge and continuity of effort that merits examination in a single application.


Additionally, it is respectfully urged that restricting the claims in the manner suggested in the Restriction Requirement constitutes an undue burden to Applicants as well as to the public.

The cost of prosecuting and maintaining additional patents is unreasonable in view of the fact that the two Groups are so closely related. Further, the public is inconvenienced as they will not know whether or not Applicants will file a divisional application to the remaining subject matter. Accordingly, the public will not know if they can practice the remaining invention without infringing future patent applications.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction and election of species requirements are respectfully requested.

No fee is believed required for consideration of this paper. If any fee is deemed necessary, authorization is given to charge the amount of any such fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2525.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Samuel H. Megerditchian
(Reg. No. 45,678)
340 Kingsland Street
Nutley, NJ 07110
Telephone (973) 235-4391
Telefax: (973) 235-2363

234994